

---

**DCSS P3 PROJECT  
TRAINING WORKGROUP  
JULY 20, 2000 MEETING  
MEETING SUMMARY**

**A. GENERAL**

On Thursday, July 20, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Training Workgroup held its first official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Doris Keller, State Co-Leader (DCSS Supervisor)
- ☒ Debra Paddack, County Co-Leader (Analyst---Sonoma)
- ☒ Ann Love, State Analyst (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Pamela Korman, County Analyst (Manager---San Bernadino)
- ☒ Sharon Quinn, Small County Rep (Senior DDA---Placer)
- ☒ Mary Leibham, Medium County Rep (Manager---Stanislaus)
- ☒ James Martinez, Large County Rep (FSO Supervisor---Fresno)
- ☒ Nora O'Brien, Advocate (Director, ACES)
- ☒ Pat Pianko, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☒ Michael Wright, Judicial Council Rep (Senior Attorney---AOC)
- ☐ Pamela Pankey, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☐ Stan Dettner, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Peter Dosh, FTB Rep (CAMP)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Julie Hopkins, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Kathie Lalonde, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Nancy Bienia, Resource (OCSE Rep---DC)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Julie Hopkins at [julie.hopkins@dss.ca.gov](mailto:julie.hopkins@dss.ca.gov).

Julie Hopkins opened the meeting with a discussion of housekeeping items. She then asked that the members of the group introduce themselves, describing their experience levels and each person's hoped-for goal to be achieved by the Training Committee.

- MICHAEL WRIGHT: a coordinated training approach by all the partners: Family Support, Commissioners, and DSS
- ANN LOVE: with state, 7 years experience. Hoped-for goal: to help the group accomplish all the things they've set out to do.
- PAM KORMAN: San Bernardino FSD, 7 years experience. Hoped-for goal: uniformity, understanding of what we should be doing and how to do it.

- NORA O'BRIEN: California state Director for ACES; training and support to child support members. 6 years experience; Hoped-for goal: we realize in terms of training that training is equally important for members of the public as for the employees.
- MARY LIEBMAN: Stanislaus FSD, 22 years experience in child support, extensive supervisory experience and training experience; Hoped-for goal: uniform training program, generic enough to present to staff of each FSD office (support staff and clerical) to expand their program knowledge and assist them to provide better customer service along with doing their assigned jobs. We need to coordinate with the State and utilize a lot of the tools and programs existing.
- JAMES MARTINEZ: Fresno County 14 years experience (UIFSA expert). Hoped-for goal: consistency for the public in the services offered and the manner in which the services are offered.
- PETER DOSH: FTB, collections supervisor, 7 years experience in child support. Hoped-for goal: uniform policy and clarification: when is it best for a county to do enforcement versus when should FTB provide training and do the action.
- DEBRA PADDACK: Sonoma County, 13 years experience. Hoped-for goal: uniformity and consistency, good standardized training: especially collections improved because of improved training. Clarification of the complicated areas of program practice.
- DORIS KELLER: DCSS Training Unit, 13 years experience in child support. Hoped-for goal: direction for how the State Training Unit should be organized, what should we be accomplishing, uniformity, and enough power and information to persuade the state managers making the decisions to go along with what Plans we make.
- PAT PIANKO: Federal OCSE, Region 9, assigned to oversee support in California. 1.5 years in child support. Hoped-for goal; wants to help California get through these projects successfully. Wants to ensure all training is uniform, that everyone receives the same training.

## **B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES**

The group briefly discussed the work they had done in San Francisco. All agreed that the group was on the right track, and should proceed as planned in San Francisco. Sharon Quinn initially agreed to be the Scribe, though Julie later took on this role. Pete Dosh agreed to take Action Items and identify System Requirements. Both Mary Leibham and James Martinez agreed to review all minutes from all other workgroups, in order to identify crosscutting issues.

## **C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA**

- 1 List and prioritize Stakeholders (already done).
- 2 Update the list of Stakeholders outlined at last meeting.
- 3 Describe the training needs of each group of Stakeholders.

## **D. REVIEW OF PRIORITY STAKEHOLDERS**

Add additional Stakeholders suggested by Pat Pianko:

- County Boards of Supervisors: categorized as Priority Two, Short Term needs
- Penal Institutions – Priority Three
- Department of Motor Vehicles
- Social Security Administration

Additional Stakeholder suggested by Nora O'Brien:

- California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Priority Five, Long Term needs.

It was agreed that the definition of group Priority Three would be corrected to be “Other State and Federal Agencies”, to include any federal agencies who are involved in support enforcement. SSA and Penal Institutions and DMV go into Priority Three.

There was some discussion whether to include unions in the stakeholder groups. They run their own training, and could use specific knowledge of how to deal with wage withholdings, etc.. It was determined that unions should be included in the employers' group (Priority 4).

## **E. TRAINING NEEDS OF EACH PRIORITY GROUP**

The group moved on to a discussion of the training needs of each of the priority groups. Some members preferred to focus on the kinds of training that can't be put out on a website. A suggestion was also made that for “on-site” types of training, the state could be divided into regions and a contract made with colleges to provide local, standardized training.

The group began brainstorming and discussion of the training needs for the priority groups. There was disagreement on how detailed this brainstorming should be. This led to discussion of the end goal of group:

**Everyone who works in the California child support program will have the skills to do their job efficiently and effectively and will have the tools to provide accurate and consistent information to all customers.**

It was agreed that the group would first look at the groups themselves, and reserve returning to the priority groups to get more detailed information. As a homework assignment, members of the group will review the priority areas and agreed-upon types of training for each group to arrive at more detailed training needs. There was a great deal of discussion in this area, with strong feelings as to the level of detail the group should go into. Again, it was agreed that some of this detailed information could be fleshed out in subsequent sessions.

Priority One: The group brainstormed the types of training that this group might need. This information has been entered in the matrix below.

Priority Two: Extensive discussion of the enforcement needs of commissioners. Regardless, this is a separation of power issue: executive and judicial. DCSS can dictate hours, staffing structures, etc., but not how they do the job, or how they apply the law. Orientation would be necessary in all aspects of child support; give them option to attend most/all of the training

that is available to priority one folks. Need for cooperation between judicial council and DCSS – memorandum of understanding. Provides cross-training opportunity as well – between judicial and administrative activities.

In our discussions, there was some comment/confusion on the types of training different stakeholders within the same priority would receive. The group agreed that, within each priority group, there would be “gradations” of training, with more detailed information included for some groups than for others. It may be necessary to further define each training area so that the group may reach consensus. There was a vote to determine whether Priority Two groups should receive enforcement training; result was affirmative.

Extensive discussion of FTB training needs was held. It was agreed that FTB needs to know everything, that their work will always be program driven. It was agreed that FTB Automation would be moved up to Priority One; other FTB areas would remain in Priority Two status.

Curt Child made a brief visit to the session; he questioned the use of Priority One through Five designations. Would these designations be useful if DCSS training resources were limited? In this instance, would DCSS begin with the Priority One group and move down, as funding allowed? The answer was yes, and the group discussed the definitions of each priority area. Priority One stakeholders must be trained first, they are in-house DCSS and county employees, who are necessary for the program to run.

The group discussed a recommendation that judiciary and DCSS coordinate training together and work together in developing training.

COORDINATION. Any attorney-training track will need to be qualified as CLE training, meeting the MCLE requirements. It appeared to some that DCSS training would be taking over much of the CDAA function in this area. Cheryl Brown has a manual on the procedures needed to achieve qualification for CLE credit. Sharon Quinn will contact her for this information.

There was some confusion as to the difference between Orientation Training and Overview Training. The group agreed that Orientation training would target “internal” stakeholders, such as employees, while Overview training would target “external” stakeholders, such as custodial and non-custodial parents. Topics covered for each would be as follows:

**Orientation Training**

Confidentiality  
All of Overview material

**Overview Training**

Who we are  
What we can do  
What we don’t do  
POP Program  
Why we do it  
Automation Status  
Transition of Program  
IV-A/IV-E Relationship  
Intake thru Enforcement

### Judicial Process

We then moved through Priorities Three through Five, to determine if the groups should receive certain categories of training. Discussion results are laid out in the matrix below.

TRAINING TYPE	P ONE	P TWO	P THREE	P FOUR	P FIVE
Orientation	X	X			
Interviewing Skills	X				
Customer Service	X	X			
Enforcement	X	X	X	X	
Intake	X				
Interstate	X	X	X	X	
Paternity (POP)	X	X	X	X	
Establishment	X	X	X	X	
Financial	X				
Legal/Courts	X		X	X	X
Locate	X				
Case Management	X		X	X	
Automated Systems	X	X			
Overview (Public Outreach)	X	X	X	X	X
IV-A/IV-E	X				
Staff Development	X				
Complaint Resolution	X	X	X	X	X
Reports	X				
Collection and Distribution	X	X	X	X	X
Medical Support	X	X			
Community Resources	X	X	X	X	X
Administrative/Managerial	X				
Training of Trainers	X				
Update Training/New Legislation	X	X	X	X	X

The meeting concluded with extensive discussion of making direct contact with the counties for information. Several members of the group have contacts that can easily provide them with information that the group needs. Julie advised that we had been instructed not to contact the counties directly; the P3 Project Team would create a survey that encompassed all of the needed information for all the workgroups. This was necessary to avoid the counties being overrun with a deluge of requests and to allow for the information to be captured in a centralized data repository.

### F. HANDOUTS

- Map of Planned Automated Systems by County

## **G. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION**

- The group reviewed homework assignments from last session. Group members that had assignments reported on the status of each assignment.
- See attached listing.

## **J. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES**

- Transition of systems from 20-6-1: how to meet long-term training needs during the transition from various systems. Keep discussion here at high level – address long-term needs through 1 to 3 to 5 year goals, which consider above issues. As uniformity and standardization are achieved, training piece will be pulled in.
- Transition process
- Uniform case management across counties
- County organizational structure
- Identify training needs of stakeholders initially; hope that this group becomes a Task Force that will go into more detail; expanding upon the levels we have defined. Ties into recommendation for statewide certification. Pass exam covering pieces of knowledge, so that everyone knows timeframes and next steps.
- Listing of other assistance and resources available to CPs/NCPs within the community.
- Will state training qualify for CLE?
- Need for public outreach to advise public of automation issues: particularly transition from 20-6-1 automated systems. Public service announcements, other items that county can tap into when it comes time for them to transition. Letting public (especially CPs, NCPs, other agencies) know when automation transitions occur and how services may be impacted. (Cross over for Access Group)?
- Can a IV-D agency have input or require certain training of the judiciary?
- How will training for judicial council be synchronized?

## **K. ATTACHMENTS**

- Action Item List (incorporates Kickoff Conference Meetings and Session One)

## **L. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR SESSION TWO**

1. Complete Stakeholder Needs Assessment
2. Determine Training Type Definition
3. Research and Information Reporting
4. Develop Constituency Survey
5. Develop Recommendations for Future Full Survey and Needs Assessment